

REMARKS

5 This paper responds to the Office Action dated June 4, 2004.

Enablement in the specification. The Examiner objects to the specification as supposedly failing to provide enablement for a limitation in claim 18: "wherein during the longer exposure of one subset, steps (b) are performed for all other subsets". It is noted that this same limitation
10 appeared in originally filed claim 9, yet the Examiner raised no such objection with respect to that claim.

In any event, the Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to page 5, lines 11-14, where this limitation is discussed in great detail.

15 **Enablement as to claim 18.** The Examiner finds fault with claims 18-24 as supposedly failing to enable one skilled in the art to practice the invention. The Examiner is requested to note that claim 18 is intended to include features of originally filed claims 1, 7, 8, and 9. Most of the language of claim 18 is drawn directly from originally filed claim 1. The limitation that the
20 number of runs is *two* is drawn from originally filed claim 7. The limitation directed to longer and shorter exposures is drawn from originally filed claim 8. A related limitation about first and second subsets is drawn from originally filed claim 9.

From this a few observations are in order. First, if claim 18 were supposedly lacking
25 enablement, then from this it would follow that originally filed claims 1, 7, 8, and 9 likewise would have lacked enablement from the moment the application was filed. Yet this application has been pending for over three and a half years, with no question raised to date as to the enablement of originally filed claims 1, 7, 8, and 9.

30 The Examiner is likewise requested to note that each of originally filed claims 1, 7, 8, and 9 has

ample support in the specification as filed. For example the limitations of originally filed claim 1 may be seen in the specification at page 4, lines 1-7. The limitations of originally filed claim 7 may be seen in the specification at page 4, line 16. The limitations of originally filed claim 8 may be seen in the specification at page 4, line 17. The limitations of originally filed claim 9 may be seen in the specification at page 5, lines 11-14. The limitations of present claim 18 may likewise be seen at those places in the specification.

Reconsideration of the rejection for a supposed lack of enablement is requested.

Definiteness. The Examiner finds fault with claims 18-24 as supposedly being indefinite. Claim 18 has been amended to clarify the issue raised by the Examiner relating to first and second subsets.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl Oppedahl
PTO Reg. No. 32,746
Oppedahl & Larson LLP
P O Box 5068
Dillon, CO 80435-5068
telephone 970-468-6600